



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/825,359	04/16/2004	Peter Gibson	22409-00107-US	8104
30678 7590 07/09/2008 CONNOLLY BOVE LODGE & HUTZ LLP 1875 EYE STREET, N.W. SUITE 1100 WASHINGTON, DC 20036				
EXAMINER				
HOLMES, REX R				
ART UNIT		PAPER NUMBER		
3762				
NOTIFICATION DATE		DELIVERY MODE		
07/09/2008		ELECTRONIC		

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Notice of the Office communication was sent electronically on above-indicated "Notification Date" to the following e-mail address(es):

patent@cblh.com

Office Action Summary

Application No.

10/825,359

Applicant(s)

GIBSON, PETER

Examiner

REX HOLMES

Art Unit

3762

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 25 March 2008.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1, 2, 4-9, 14, 20-24, 27, 28, 30, 31 and 89-116 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1, 2, 4-9, 14, 20-24, 27-28, 30-31, and 89-116 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☐ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
- 6) ☐ Other: _____

DETAILED ACTION

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102/103

1. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

2. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

3. Claims 1-2, 4, 7-9, 14, 20, 24, 27-28, 30-31, 89-93, 98-100, 104-110 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Berrang et al. (U.S. Pub. 2002/0019669 hereinafter "Berrang") or, in the alternative, under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as obvious over Berrang.

4. Berrang discloses a hearing aid/cochlear apparatus that comprises a housing adapted to abut the patient's bone (Figure 6). Berrang further discloses that the housing can be made out of ceramic (¶¶ 23, 25), and includes components located within the housing (2), and an osseointegrating protuberance that extends from the housing into the bone (¶ 22). Berrang further discloses that the device is a tissue-stimulating device (Figs. 1-6; ¶ 77).

5. Berrang discloses that the implantable device is configured, to be secured to the mastoid portion of the temporal bone in the tissue surrounding the skull (Fig. 3-6).

Berrang further discloses that the fixation device is a threaded screw and is capable of being removed after osseointegration (¶ 22).

6. Regarding claim 106, Berrang further discloses that the housing is coated with a medical grade silicone (¶ 69).

7. Regarding claims 108-110, Examiner notes the limitation "configured to be placed in direct contact with but not within the bone and further configured to gradually sink into the bone during osseointegration of said protuberance", is only functional language and only requires the capability to so perform. Here the titanium screws are capable of being positioned adjacent the bone and are further capable of sinking into the bone during osseointegration.

8. In the alternative, Berrang discloses that it has a housing made out of ceramic and protuberances made out of titanium, but Berrang fails to disclose that ceramic is non-osseointegrating and titanium is osseointegrating. However, the Applicant's specification discloses that ceramic is a non-osseointegrating material and that titanium is a osseointegrating material (Applicants Spec. ¶35). Further, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have used the device to allow for replacement of the device while still allowing for osseointegration of the screws, as it was known in the art that titanium promotes bone growth and ceramics do not promote bone growth.

9. Claims 5-6, 21-23, 94-96, 101-103 and 112-113 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Berrang as applied to claims 1, 93 and 98 above, and further in view of Håkansson (U.S. Pat. 6,840,919).
10. Regarding claims 5-6, 21-23, 94-96, 101-103 and 112-113, Berrang discloses the claimed invention as described in detail above, except for the elongated flanges that hold the disposed protuberances at opposing angles. Håkansson teaches that it is known to use flanges and anchoring devices that are disposed at an opposing angle that is approximately 85 degrees and in the same plane as set forth in Figures 1 and 2 to provide anchoring means for the implantable device. It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the hearing aid as taught by Berrang, with flanges and multiple anchors disposed in the flanges at opposing angles as taught by Håkansson, since such a modification would provide the predictable results of a hearing aid with strong anchoring means for providing increased hold and more surface area for osseointegration.

Response to Arguments

11. Applicant's arguments with respect to claims arguments filed 3/25/08 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.
12. Regarding the rejection of claims 1-2, 4, 7-9, 14, 20, 24, 27-28, 30-31, 89-93, 98-100, 104-110, Applicant argues that Berrang does not teach a device that has an exterior surface adapted to prevent osseointegration. The Applicant points out that in one embodiment the ceramic housing is encapsulated to hermetically seal the device thus the devices exterior is not ceramic and thus does not prevent osseointegration.

The examiner respectfully disagrees. Berrang in paragraph 25 specifically points out that the entire housing can be made out of ceramic that is laser, ultrasonically or electrically welded making a hermetically sealed device. Thus, the exterior of the device is comprised of ceramic and thus it prevents osseointegration. It is noted that in the embodiment with the ceramic housing, the seams need to be coated with titanium to weld, however, the external surface is still ceramic and prevents osseointegration. Further, the claim states that the housing only requires an outer surface that prevents osseointegration and not that the entire external surface of the device prevents osseointegration.

13. Regarding claims 5-6, 21-23, 94-96, 101-103 and 112-113, the Applicant argues that Håkansson does not disclose or teach varying the opposing angles between the longitudinal axes of the protuberances and the implant axis. The Applicant further argues that Håkansson does not disclose, teach or suggest that varying the opposing angles is a means to effect a permanent or removable implantation. The Examiner respectfully disagrees. Håkansson teaches the structure of the claims as showing in Figures 1 and 2. It is noted that the claims requires opposing angles that are approximately 85 degrees. The structure as shown in Figures 1 and 2 shows opposing angles that are approximately 85 degrees. Regarding the Applicants arguments that Håkansson does not disclose, teach or suggest that varying the opposing angles is a means to effect a permanent or removable implantation, it is noted that the claims are directed toward a device and the prior art of Håkansson discloses the structure as

defined by the claims. It is further noted that the intended use of the device does not patently distinguish the claims over the prior art.

Conclusion

1. Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP

§ 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire **THREE MONTHS** from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within **TWO MONTHS** of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the **THREE-MONTH** shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than **SIX MONTHS** from the date of this final action.

14. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure. Berrang et al. (U.S. Pat. 6,516,228), De Rowe (U.S. Pat. 6,042,380), Dugot (U.S. Pat. 5,738,521), Gilman (U.S. Pat. 5,176,620), Jeffcoat et al. (4,333,469) – All discuss the bone growth properties of titanium.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to REX HOLMES whose telephone number is (571)272-8827. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F 8:00 - 5:00.

Art Unit: 3762

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Angela Sykes can be reached on 571-272-4955. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/R. H./
Examiner, Art Unit 3762

/George R Evanisko/
Primary Examiner, Art Unit 3762